



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,491	10/19/1999	HIDEKAZU TAKEYAMA	040679/0951	2877

7590

08/08/2003

FOLEY & LARDNER
WASHINGTON HARBOUR
3000 K STREET NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 200075109

EXAMINER

RAJGURU, UMAKANT K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711

23

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 12, 2003 (paper 21)

☒ This action is FINAL.

- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) ~~2-10~~ 2-13 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 3-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 10-13 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1711

1. An amendment (paper 21) has been filed on May 12, 2003
2. Claims being examined are 2 and 10-13.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 2 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakshmanan et al (USP 4857594).

Please refer to papers 8 and 11 for this rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed May 12, 2003 (paper 21) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 6 of above paper, the applicants' argument that "the adhesive of Lakshmanan is used for permanent bonding while the one of instant invention is a removable bonding" is true but not persuasive because the compositions of Lakshmanan and of instant invention are looked upon as adhesive, the difference between them being their varying adhesive strengths. Also none of the instant claims encompasses any limitation about temporary or permanent bonding. *attorney's intent to amend claim 10,*

The applicants state on page 8, that "the ingredients are not same". This statement is not acceptable since Lakshmanan in col. 5, lines 10-18 teaches low molecular weight polybutenes, polyisobutylenes, paraffin and microcrystalline waxes etc some of which are useful as plasticizer (see instant specification, page 7, lines 13-14). These can be used up to 40% by wt.

Applicants' statement on page 9, that "shell wax 700 is not included in overlap" is not convincing. Wax is well-known as a lubricant as well as a plasticizer. Lakshmanan

uses it at (claimed) 47.50% by wt in run # 6. Lakshmanan therefore renders instant claims prima facie obvious.

The examiner had considerable discussion with the attorney during which the examiner had made few suggestions. However the attorney was unable to respond in time.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to U. K. Rajguru whose telephone number is 703-308-3224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on 703-308-2462. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-

Application/Control Number: 09/420,491

Art Unit: 1711

872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


U. K. Rajguru/mn
July 31, 2003

James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700